Remarks

The present response is filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on March 9, 2004, made Final. Claims 1-18 are presented below for examination. The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Logue of record.

Applicant has again carefully studied the reference of Logue, and the Examiner's statements in the Response to Arguments section of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the language of the base claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of applicant's invention regarded as patentable. Applicant points out and argues the key and patentable aspects of applicant's invention, as more clearly recited in the claims as amended, which will clearly demonstrate that the reference of Logue fails to anticipate all of the claimed limitations.

Applicant herein amends claim 1 to specifically recite monitoring by the proxy server connected to the data-packet network, user access and post-access online user activity and transactions associated with interactive use with the proxy services. Applicant's claim 13 is applicant's method claim in accordance with the data-collection system of claim 1, reciting many of the same limitations. Applicant accordingly amends the language of claim 13 similarly to claim 1, to more particularly recite the monitoring of user activity, agreeing in language with claim 1 as amended. Applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended for convenience below.

Applicant's claim 1 as amended now recites:

1. (presently amended) A data-collection system for collecting data about a user through monitoring user interaction on a data-packet-network comprising:

a proxy server connected to the data-packet-network for providing proxy services and for actively monitoring user access and post-access online user activity and transactions associated with the proxy services;

a dedicated server interface connected to the data-packet-network for providing user access to the proxy services; and

a software application running on the proxy server for collecting and storing data obtained as a result of the monitored active user-interaction with the proxy services.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner has noted that the features upon which applicant relied in the previous arguments provided in applicant's last response (i.e. "interaction with proxy services") are not recited in the rejected claims, and that the limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. The Examiner continues that monitoring the fact that a user accesses a particular URL may be fairly interpreted as "interaction".

In view of applicant's claim amendments made herein, applicant believes that the extent of monitored events related to user interaction with the proxy services is now clearly recited in the claim language, and the limitations are more than adequately supported and enabled in detail in applicant's specification. The limitations in applicant's independent claims pertaining to monitoring the user interaction with the proxy services, now clearly and unarguably distinguish over the teachings provided by Logue of simply monitoring and providing to administrators at other sites, user " hit counts", or initial accesses, to Web Sites. Logue clearly teaches no capability or architecture enabling monitoring and reporting of all of a user's online activity associated with the proxy services,

detailed online activity which takes place <u>after</u> the user initially accesses the online services.

Applicant's invention monitors the user's online interaction activity after initial access, and automatically collects the user activity data either directly or through proxy services. The collected data reflects user activity, request or transaction history, data requested by the user, and other online behavior associated with the plurality of proxy services. Applicant believes that the art of Logue falls short of anticipating applicant's claimed invention as is now specifically and clearly recited in the independent claims as amended. Therefore, claims 1 and 13 are patentable over the art of Logue. Claims 2-12 and 14-18 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims argued above have been clearly shown to be patentable over the prior art presented by the Examiner, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn, and that the case be passed quickly to issue. If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Jaideep Srivastava et al.

by_____
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457